



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

an emperor and that he owed his crown to his army. There are some other parts of the book where one cannot help wishing that the author had been more thoroughgoing and had grappled a little more earnestly with some of the difficult problems presented by Julian's unique and many-sided personality, but even more serious defects than this any one would gladly overlook in a book containing the characterization of Julian with which Miss Gardner closes her remarks upon his place in history. We know of nothing finer and more discriminating than the following estimate of him:—

"If we look at him impartially and yet with the sympathetic understanding that we can only obtain after trying in imagination to realize his point of view, we see in him not a genius of the first rank in statesmanship, strategy, literature or religious philosophy; not a character unequalled in virtue and strength, but a man who did something because of his earnest devotion to his ideals and who would have done more if he had been gifted with a surer insight and had moved at a less feverish pace. He was a good king and a strong warrior, as his epitaph says. Yet his conduct at Antioch showed him unable to meet all the requirements of a disordered state, and his neglect of precautions, especially in the Persian war, prevents us from ranking him among the great generals of the world. He wrote in what for his age may be regarded as a pure style, but he wrote too rapidly to produce any great work. He was a thinker and often throws a ray of light on matters obscured by convention and prejudice, but his mind was not calm and collected enough for us to rank him among great philosophers. His personal character is most attractive. He had warm affections, a strong desire to do justice, and an abiding sense of moral responsibility." . . . "Yet with all his love of truth and goodness there were some potent types which he was quite incapable of recognizing. With all his desire for equity he could not always be fair to those whom he could not understand. In spite of his realization of the littleness of human effort in the universal system of nature and man, he could not see how powerless were his own endeavors to oppose a barrier to the incoming tide.

"Yet Julian was one to whom much may be forgiven because he loved much. If turning aside from the account of his short and chequered career we look to the main principle by which he was throughout guided we see that it was an entire devotion to the Greek idea of thought and life, a settled determination to prevent as far as in him lay the destruction, by what he regarded as barbarous and degraded forces, of that fair fabric of ancient civilization under which men had learned to venerate beauty and order, to aim at a reasonable, well-contained life, and to live in orderly society under intelligible laws and humane institutions."

A. C. MCGIFFERT.

*An Advanced History of England.* By CYRIL RANSOME. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. xviii, 1069.)  
*A History of England.* By CHARLES OMAN. (London: Edward Arnold. 1895. Pp. iv, 760.)

THE publication in rapid succession of two histories of England, both written by experienced teachers of history, testifies to the need felt for a

compendious text-book on English history for the use of schools and colleges. Both books are designed for English students, and neither of them makes any special pretension to satisfying the needs of American teachers and students. It is exceedingly doubtful whether an English writer could possibly produce a book suitable for college use in America. This is not entirely owing to the natural difference in the point of view from which English history is regarded in the two countries, but to the fact that certain essential features in English history, as for instance the position of the Church in England, are unintelligible to American students without a far more elaborate explanation than is necessary for Englishmen who have absorbed a knowledge of ecclesiastical history from the very existence among them of parish churches and cathedrals. Professor Ransome has for many years held the post of Professor of History in the Yorkshire College at Leeds, one of the best local educational institutions in England, while Mr. Oman is well known at Oxford as one of the ablest history tutors in the university. Their experience has, therefore, been with different types of pupils, but both of them in their prefaces urge their practical knowledge of the needs of teachers and pupils in justification of their appearing as authors of somewhat lengthy and methodical histories of England. They do not cater to the general reader, whose needs are splendidly supplied by Green's *Short History of the English People*, a work not likely to be surpassed during the present generation for general purposes, though it is unfortunately ill-fitted by its very virtues for a college text-book. Both Professor Ransome and Mr. Oman have already gained considerable reputation as historical writers, the former by his excellent *Short History of England*, the latter by his *Art of War in the Middle Ages*, his *History of Europe A.D. 476-918*, and other works. Their latest productions, therefore, have been eagerly looked forward to by historical teachers and scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.

It must be said at once that Professor Ransome's book is marred by a great and essential fault. It is full of inaccuracies. However great may be the shortcomings of a text-book in other respects, they can generally be forgiven if the facts are accurately stated. But, on the other hand, however great may be the merits of a text-book in other respects, it must be condemned if inaccurate. Professor Ransome's book possesses many merits; the space given to periods and events is fairly proportioned; the judgments passed on historical characters are generally just; the accounts of military operations are excellent and illustrated by useful plans of battles; and it presents no partisan view of men or political parties. This is high praise; but every reader of Professor Ransome's little book expected these merits. What was unexpected is the inaccuracy, which makes the book practically useless for teaching purposes. It is hardly possible to look at a page without finding one or more mistakes. Turning, for instance, at random to the chapter on Henry II., the date of the Assize of Clarendon is given as 1156 instead of 1166 (p. 145), and a couple of paragraphs later the date of the Battle of Clontarf is given as

1017 instead of 1014 (p. 147). A most casual examination will show many similar instances of carelessness, as for instance the statement that Madras was founded in 1629 instead of 1639 (p. 797). The author's account of the American War of Independence is full of inaccuracies; he speaks of *Sir* John Burgoyne, though Burgoyne never was knighted; he deprives General Greene of his final *e*; and must needs offend the patriotism of inhabitants of Brooklyn by remarking that Howe withdrew his troops to Long Island, "on which Brooklyn, now a populous suburb of New York, stands" (p. 825). His remarks on Washington, contained in the following sentence, illustrate the tendency of modern English writers to glorify Washington at the expense of the other leaders in the American Revolution, and show a curiously inverted attitude of mind, which must seem strange to American students. "George Washington," he says, "was a Virginia planter and a thorough gentleman, whose simple and fearless character and transparent honesty of purpose gave dignity to the cause which he espoused and inspired respect among the democratic officers and men with whom he had to deal" (p. 825). Professor Ransome's account of the War of 1812 is equally unsatisfactory. He patriotically asserts that the American ships were successful in their duels with the English ships because they were better found, and goes on to state that "in some fights, however, where the vessels were practically on an equality, the British won" (p. 903). He attributes the success of the Americans on the Great Lakes to the superiority of their flotilla and the inferiority of the English commander, and twice miscalls Sir Edward Pakenham Sir *John* Pakenham (p. 904). Whenever Professor Ransome touches on American affairs he makes mistakes; his treatment of the American Civil War is exceedingly faulty. Comment upon the following sentences is needless. "In the end," he says, "the Northerners defeated the Southerners owing to their greater numbers, their greater wealth, and their ability to establish a navy, which gave them command of the sea, which enabled them to paralyse the commerce of the Southerners and to use the seacoast as a basis for military operations, — advantages of which full use was made by the dogged determination of President Lincoln and the military skill of General Grant. During the war the slaves of the Southern States were declared *by the Federal Congress* to be free, and since then the negroes of the United States have had in law the same rights as their fellow-citizens" (p. 1000).

Mr. Oman's book is written on much the same scale as Professor Ransome's, but is perhaps a little more "modern" in form and treatment. It is clearly to be perceived in studying its pages that the author belongs to a later generation of historians than Professor Ransome, and that he is in closer touch with modern historical ideas as developed in Oxford. His book does not offend by the innumerable inaccuracies which mar the merits of its rival, but on the other hand its literary style, in the endeavor to be bright and interesting, compares badly with the sobriety of Professor Ransome's language. Occasionally a certain archaic pedantry in the use

of words is to be observed in the earlier chapters, and a protest must be entered against using, in a book intended for the use of college students, such an adjective as "autolatrous," which is applied on page 574 to Louis XIV. It may perhaps be interesting to compare Mr. Oman's treatment of the American War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the American Civil War with Professor Ransome's attitude on these subjects. Mr. Oman, too, ignores all the heroes of the American Revolution except Washington, and illustrates the English tendency, already alluded to, of exaggerating the rôle of Washington and ignoring or depreciating the work of other leaders. "George Washington," he writes, "was a Virginian planter, who had seen much service in the last French War, and was almost the only colonist who possessed a good military reputation. No choice could have been better; Washington was a staid, upright, energetic man, very different from the windy demagogues who led the rebellion in most of the colonies" (p. 546). It would take too long to examine further Mr. Oman's account of the American War of Independence, but it seems, on the whole, more adequate than Professor Ransome's, although perhaps excessively condensed. With regard to the War of 1812, Mr. Oman, like Professor Ransome, apologizes for the defeats suffered by the English ships in naval duels in the following words: "The fact was that individually the American ships were larger and carried heavier guns than our own, so that the first defeats were no matter of shame to our navy" (p. 627). The military operations are described in half a dozen sentences in which Mr. Oman speaks of Sir George Prevost as "imbecile," and of Sir Edward Pakenham as "over-bold." With regard to his treatment of the Civil War, Mr. Oman is biassed by his passionate admiration for Lord Palmerston, whom he terms "the most striking personage in the middle years of the century" and the statesman who "won and merited the confidence of the nation more than any minister since the younger Pitt" (p. 699). Mr. Oman makes no attempt to describe the events of the Civil War itself, and therefore does not give himself the opportunity of going wrong to the same extent as Professor Ransome. He devotes himself rather to explaining according to his lights how English opinion was divided upon the subject, and to giving high praise to Palmerston, who, according to his theory, tried to steer a middle course, and was not, as ninety-nine out of a hundred people have always held, the mainstay of the Southern sympathizers in England. "It was urged," says Mr. Oman, "that the North were fighting for the cause of liberty against slavery; and this idea affected many earnest-minded men, to the exclusion of any other consideration. On the other side it was urged that the Southern States were exercising an undoubted constitutional right in severing themselves from the Union, and this was true enough in itself. It was certain that the Southerners, who wished for Free Trade, were likely to be better friends of England than the protectionist North, which had always shown a bitter jealousy of English commerce. Many men were moved by the rather unworthy consideration that America was growing so strong and populous

that she might one day become 'the bully of the world,' and welcomed a convulsion that threatened to split the Union into two hostile halves. Others illogically sympathized with the South merely because it was the weaker side, or because they thought the Southern planters better men than the hard and astute traders of the North. The Palmerston Cabinet, with great wisdom, tried to steer a middle course and to avoid all interference. But when the Confederates held their own in arms, they thought themselves bound to recognize them as a belligerent power and to treat them as a nation" (p. 696). Comment upon this passage, with its curious travesty of Palmerston's position, is needless.

It is to be stated in conclusion that both these new histories of England are strong upon the military side and that they are both illustrated with several plans of famous battles. The distinguished authors have produced books which will hardly increase their reputation as historians, but which are nevertheless gallant attempts to meet the want which undoubtedly exists for a competent and scholarly history of England for the use of high schools and colleges.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

*Feudal England: Historical Studies on the XIth and XIIth Centuries.* By J. H. ROUND, M.A. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1895. Pp. xvi, 587.)

MOST of the papers in this volume have appeared in recent years in the *English Historical Review* and other periodicals; they have been carefully revised, and much new matter has been added. This series of studies, covering the years 1050-1200, is called *Feudal England*, because some of them deal with the origins or early history of the feudal system. A title referring to Domesday Book would, perhaps, be more appropriate, for in the most important essays Domesday Book is carefully exploited; and the most valuable results of Mr. Round's researches are largely based on that great record or on kindred surveys. This volume will, in fact, give him a high rank among Domesday investigators; in his profound knowledge of its formulas and contents he stands without a peer. In *Feudal England*, as in *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, he displays consummate skill in the critical study of records, and uses the evidence thus obtained to check and supplement the chroniclers.

Mr. Round's minute investigations do not yield a mere mass of curious information; some of his deductions are of far-reaching importance. The most instructive papers are those on "Domesday Book" (pp. 3-146) and "The Introduction of Knight Service into England" (pp. 225-314). The second half of the volume is largely devoted to the errors of Professor Freeman, who is accused of viewing plain facts "through a mist of moots and witan" and of sinning against all the canons of historical learning. As regards the famous controversy concerning the palisade at the Battle of Hastings, no one, it seems, has ever called attention to the fact